

Application No.: 10/616,420
Filing Date: July 08, 2003

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the pending claims on February 10, 2011. Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 19 along the lines discussed with the Examiner during the interview. The amendments to Claims 1 and 19 are supported in the specification. See paragraphs [0033]-[0038] of the application as filed. Thus, Claims 1-8, 19, 20, and 25-26 are pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and further examination in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-8 and 25 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,611 (“Freund”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,801,747 (“Bedard”) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,486,892 (“Stern”), and Claims 1-8, 19, 20, 25 and 26 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over International Publication Number WO 98/28690 (“Willens”) in view of Bedard, Stern, and Freund.

Amended Claims 1 and 19 each recite, for example, “said Internet site being previously associated with said content category based on one or more lexical elements from said Internet site.” As agreed during the interview, the applied does not teach at least this feature. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of independent Claims 1 and 19 in view of the applied art.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-8, 20, and 25-26 depend directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1 or 19 and, thus, are patentable for at least the same reasons that support the allowance of the respective claim from which they depend.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is most earnestly solicited.

Application No.: 10/616,420
Filing Date: July 08, 2003

Any remarks in support of patentability of one claim should not be imputed to any other claim, even if similar terminology is used. Additionally, any remarks referring to only a portion of a claim should not be understood to base patentability on solely that portion; rather, patentability must rest on each claim taken as a whole. Applicant respectfully traverses each of the Examiner's rejections and each of the Examiner's assertions regarding what the prior art discloses or teaches, even if not expressly discussed herein. Although changes to the claims have been made, no acquiescence or estoppel is or should be implied thereby; such amendments are made only to expedite prosecution of the present application and are without prejudice to the presentation or assertion, in the future, of claims relating to the same or similar subject matter.

The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's attorney in order to resolve such issue promptly.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: February 10, 2011

By: 

James F. Herkenhoff
Registration No. 51,241
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20995
(858) 836-9000

10678608